arXiv:1407.1209v3 [cs.DS] 28 May 2015

A Bit-Parallel Russian Dolls Search for a Maximum Cardinality Clique in a Graph*

Ricardo C. Corrêa
Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro,
Departamento de Ciência da Computação,
Av. Governador Roberto Silveira S/N,
26020-740 Nova Iguaçu - RJ, Brazil

Philippe Michelon
Université d'Avignon et des Pays du Vaucluse,
Laboratoire d'Informatique d'Avignon,
F-84911 Avignon, Cedex 9, France

Bertrand Le Cun, Thierry Mautor
Université de Versailles Saint Quentin,
45 Avenue des Etats Unis,
78035 Versailles, France

Diego Delle Donne
Sciences Institute,
National University of General Sarmiento,
J. M. Gutiérrez 1150, Malvinas Argentinas,
(1613) Buenos Aires, Argentina

May 29, 2015

Abstract

Finding the clique of maximum cardinality in an arbitrary graph is an NP-Hard problem that has many applications, which has motivated studies to solve it exactly despite its difficulty. The great majority of algorithms proposed in the literature are based on the Branch and Bound method. In this paper, we propose an exact algorithm for the maximum clique problem based on the Russian Dolls Search method. When compared to Branch and Bound, the main difference of the Russian Dolls method is that the nodes of its search tree correspond to decision subproblems, instead of the optimization subproblems of the Branch and Bound method. In comparison to a first implementation of this Russian Dolls method from the literature, several improvements are presented. Some of them are adaptations of techniques already employed successfully in Branch and Bound algorithms, like the use of approximate coloring for pruning purposes and bit-parallel operations. Two different coloring heuristics are tested: the standard greedy and the greedy with recoloring. Other improvements are directly related to the Russian Dolls scheme: the adoption of recursive calls where each subproblem (doll) is solved itself via the same principles than the Russian Dolls Search and the application of an elimination rule allowing not to generate a significant number of dolls. Results of computational experiments show that the algorithm outperforms the best exact combinatorial algorithms in the literature for the great majority of the dense graphs tested, being more than twice faster in several cases.

*This work has been partially supported by the Stic/AmSud joint program by CAPES (Brazil), CNRS and MAE (France), CONICYT (Chile) and MINCYT (Argentina) – project STABLE – and the Pronem program by FUNCAP/CNPq (Brazil) – project ParGO. The first author was with Universidade Federal do Ceará, Departamento de Computação, Brazil, when this work was done. The second author has been partially granted by the "Pesquisador Visitante Especial" (CNPq program) process 313831/2013-0.

1 Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple and undirected graph, with V being its set of vertices and E its set of edges. A *clique of* G is a subset (of V) of pairwise adjacent vertices. We consider the *CLIQUE problem*, which consists in finding in G a clique of maximum size $\omega(G)$, which in turn is called the *clique number of* G. In addition to its many practical applications (see for instance [1, 2, 3]), it is algorithmically equivalent to the maximum stable set and the minimum vertex cover problems ($S \subseteq V$ is a *stable set* of G if it is a clique in the complement of G and a *vertex cover* if every edge in E has at least one endpoint in S). The CLIQUE problem is in NP-hard [4] and is even hard to approximate by a reasonable factor [5], unless the graph is restricted to have a special structure. In this paper we deal with exact algorithms for determining the clique number of arbitrary graphs.

Before going into the details of the problem and its algorithms, let us state some notation.

- $V = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $N(u) = \{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in E\}$ is the *neighborhood* of a vertex u in G whose members are *neighbors* of u.
- If $U \subseteq V$, then $G[U] = (U, E[U])$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by U.
- If $v \in V$, then $U + v$ and $U - v$ stands for $U \cup \{v\}$ and $U \backslash v$, respectively.
- An *ℓ-coloring* of G is an assignment of a color from $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ to every vertex of G such that the endpoints of any edge get different colors. It can be characterized by ℓ disjoint subsets $C_1, \ldots, C_\ell$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} C_i = V$ and $G[C_i]$ is a stable set for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$.

1.2 Exact Algorithms via Branch and Bound

Several Branch and Bound (B&B) algorithms have been proposed to solve the CLIQUE problem exactly (for an overview, see [6]). As usual, such algorithms perform a search in a tree. A node in this tree is a pair (Cq, Cd) of disjoint subsets of V, where Cq is a clique of G and Cd is a set of candidate vertices, *e.g.* vertices that can extend Cq to a larger clique of G. In this manner, a node of the search tree can be alternatively seen as the root of the search tree of a smaller instance of the CLIQUE problem, more specifically the one defined on the subgraph G' of G induced by Cd. In addition to this recursive view of the search, some of the former algorithms employ relatively sophisticated procedures to obtain upper bounds for $\omega(G')$ as tight as possible in the hope of pruning the enumeration considerably [7, 8, 9]. Since the computation of such a bound is generally applied at numerous nodes of the search tree, the most recent developments were achieved with the use of simpler and faster, but still effective bounding procedures. In this vein, the most successful approach involves the use of approximate colorings of selected subgraphs of G. This bound, whose application for the CLIQUE problem was first proposed in [10], is based on the following remark:

Remark 1 (Upper bound from vertex coloring)**.** *If G admits an ℓ-coloring, then $\omega(G) \leq \ell$.*

A direct consequence of this remark is that any heuristic that provides a proper coloring of G gives an upper bound for $\omega(G)$, in special the so called *greedy coloring* heuristic: enumerate the elements of V in some pre-defined order, assigning to each vertex the smallest available color.

The algorithm MCR proposed in [11] is very representative of this approach. When a node of the search tree is explored, the greedy coloring heuristic is applied considering that the corresponding candidate vertices are stored in an array, say R. The order of the vertices in R defines the order of enumeration of the greedy coloring heuristic. The resulting coloring is then used to resort R in a non-decreasing order of colors. After that, the color $c(i)$ of $R[i]$ is an upper bound for the clique number of $G[\{R[1], \ldots, R[i]\}]$ by Remark 1. Hence, vertex $R[i]$ produces a branching only if $c(i)$+(the size of the clique defining the current node) is greater than the best clique found so far. A branching of $R[i]$ consists in the generation of the node defined by the addition of $R[i]$ to the current clique and the set of candidates $\{R[1], \ldots, R[i-1]\} \cap N(R[i])$. Experiments with this algorithm show that it attains a good tradeoff between time spent computing approximate colorings and number of nodes explored in the search tree.

It was shown with computational experiments that MCR clearly outperformed other existing algorithms in finding a maximum clique. However, some improvements not too time-consuming in comparison with the reduction in the search space thereby obtained have been performed in this basic algorithm. In [12], a more judicious ordering of the vertices in the nodes of the search tree is proposed, improving the bounds obtained with the greedy coloring heuristic. In [13] (algorithm MCS), the algorithm is modified in two points related to the coloring heuristic: first, a static order similar to the one proposed in [12] is adopted; second, a color exchange strategy is employed to try to recolor a vertex v getting a large color with a smaller one that could avoid the branching of v. Studies of the impact of vertex ordering in the coloring based strategies mentioned above can be found in [14, 15]. In [16] and [17], an heuristic is applied first: the Iterated Local Search (ILS) heuristic proposed in [18] to obtain an initial high-quality solution that allows to prune early branches of the search tree.

1.3 Bit-Level Parallelism

Another improvement of the MCR algorithm is accomplished by means of the encoding of the graph as a bitmap and the incorporation of bit-parallel operations. A leading algorithm in this direction, referred to as BBMC, is described in [19, 20]. A *bitmap* is a data structure for set encoding which stores individual elements of the set in a compact form while allows for direct address of each element. Still more interesting is its ability to benefit from the potential bit-level parallelism available in hardware to perform collective set operations through fast bit-masking operations (intersection of two sets is a typical example detailed in Section 4.1). However, to exploit this potential parallelism in practice to improve overall efficiency is not a trivial task since the manipulation of bitmaps turns out to be less efficient when the enumeration of elements is relevant [21].

The use of bit-masking operations occurs in the BBMC algorithm in two points, namely the branching and the greedy coloring heuristic. Branching corresponds to determining the set intersection $\{R[1], \ldots, R[i-1]\} \cap N(R[i])$, whereas a greedy coloring can be built as successive operations of set difference of the neigborhood of selected vertices with a set of candidates. In this sense, set intersection and set difference are the essential operations in the BBMC algorithm. These are set operations that are efficiently performed by means of bit-masking operations if the sets involved are stored as bitmaps. For this reason, bit-level parallelism has been proved to be a powerful tool in efficient implementations of the branching and bounding rules of the BBMC algorithm. Naturally, this requires that the input graph and the nodes of the search tree are stored as bitmaps.

A modification of the BBMC to encompass the recoloring strategy of the MCS algorithm and

to further reduce the time spent in the coloring based bounding procedure are the contributions in [22]. The reduction in the coloring computation time is accomplished as follows. Let us consider (Cq, Cd) as the current node and MAX as the size of the best known solution found so far. The improved bounding procedure consists in determining a maximal subgraph of $G[Cd]$ that is k-partite, for $k = MAX - |Cq|$, with a partial coloring greedy heuristic. The vertices so colored are not considered for branching. Specific rules are used to sort and select uncolored vertices for branching. Experimental results show that the number of nodes visited is almost always greater than BBMC, but significant improvement in performance occurs for a certain number of graphs.

1.4 An Exact Algorithm via the Russian Dolls Method

An alternative method, called *Russian Dolls (RD)* in its original description in [23], has also been used to solve the CLIQUE problem. When compared to B&B, the main difference of the RD method is that the nodes of its search tree correspond to decision subproblems, instead of the optimization subproblems of the B&B method. In general terms, the method consists in iteratively solving larger and larger subproblems (also referred to as *dolls*) to optimality until the global problem is solved. During this iterative process, the optimum value of each doll is taken into account when solving larger subproblems. As far as we are aware, the original application of this method to the CLIQUE problem is the algorithm proposed in [24], in which subproblems are associated with subgraphs $G_i = (V_i, E_i)$, $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, where $V_1 = \{1\}$, $V_{i+1} = V_i \cup \{i+1\}$, $E_i = E[V_i]$, and $G_n = G$ (for the sake of convenience, we use a slight modification of the notation used in [24]). An optimum solution of the doll of index i is a clique of maximum size in the associated subgraph G_i, which means that $\omega(G_i)$ is known after solving doll of index i. Thus, searching for a maximum clique in G_{i+1} corresponds to decide whether $\omega(G_{i+1}) = \omega(G_i)$ or $\omega(G_{i+1}) = \omega(G_i) + 1$. Moreover, $\omega(G_{i+1})$ can be equal to $\omega(G_i) + 1$ only if the unique vertex $i+1$ in $V_{i+1} \setminus V_i$ appears in every maximum clique of G_{i+1}. For this reason, doll of index $i+1$ is handled only once G_i is solved by solving the *decision subproblem* of deciding whether $G[V_i \cap N(i+1)]$ contains a clique of size $\omega(G_i)$ or not. Every decision subproblem is an instance of an NP-Complete problem, but hopefully of small or moderate size.

In the absence of effective strategies to reduce the search space, the time required to solve "no" decision subproblems can become prohibitively high, even for moderately sized instances. In order to try to circumvent this drawback, there are two pruning rules devised in [24] to cut a "no" decision subproblem associated with the set $V_i \cap N(i+1)$ of candidates, as follows:

1. $|V_i \cap N(i+1)| < \omega(G_i)$: in this situation, $V_i \cap N(i+1)$ does not contain enough candidates to build a clique of size $\omega(G_i)$; and

2. there exists no $j \in V_i \cap N(i+1)$ such that $\omega(G_j) = \omega(G_i)$: this is equivalent to say that $\omega(G_j)$, for all $j \in V_i$, is such that $\omega(G_j) < \omega(G_i)$ (recall that $\omega(G_j)$ has been already computed). Since $\omega(G_j)$ is an upper bound for $\omega(G[V_j \cap N(i+1)])$, we can conclude that no clique in $G[V_i \cap N(i+1)]$ has size $\omega(G_i)$.

It is worth remarking that rule 2 does not imply rule 1. The effectiveness of rule 2 on pruning "no" decision subproblems depends on how $V_j \cap N(i+1)$ differs from V_j. More specifically, when there exists $j \in V_i \cap N(i+1)$ such that $\omega(G_j) = \omega(G_i)$ and $\omega(G[V_j \cap N(i+1)]) < \omega(G_j)$, the pruning rule 2 fails to prune G_j. In this sense, a contribution of the algorithm proposed in this paper with respect to the one in [24] is the use of more effective bounding heuristics.

1.5 Our Contributions

In this paper, we propose a new exact algorithm for the CLIQUE problem based on the RD method. The goal is to provide the basic algorithm in [24] with an alternative pruning rule which allows to skip a larger number of dolls. As a result, the number of "no" decision subproblems examined is significantly reduced. For this purpose, we incorporate procedures that have already shown their effectiveness with the B&B method but, as far as we know, their performance have not yet been checked with a RD framework. These procedures need to be adapted having in mind that simplicity is very important to make the computation overhead as low as possible. In this sense, we suggest the following improvements to the original implementation of the RD algorithm presented in [24]:

- The use of partial coloring heuristics to establish the sequence of dolls $\langle G_1 = (V_1, E_1), \ldots, G_n = (V_n, E_n)\rangle$. In our algorithm, contrary to the one in [24], the sequence $\langle v_1, \ldots, v_n\rangle$ of vertices defining $V_1 = \{v_1\}$ and $V_i = V_{i-1} \cup \{v_i\}$, for $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, is not determined beforehand. Instead, the order in which the vertices are considered is established during the execution of the algorithm in order to eliminate as many dolls as possible. For this purpose, once a decision subproblem G_i, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, is solved, the choice of the next doll to handle is made depending on the answer of G_i. If G_i is a "no" instance, then we choose v_{i+1} as the smallest vertex in $V \setminus V_i$. Otherwise, G_i is a "yes" instance, which means that the current best solution is incremented as a result of solving G_i. Thus, we apply the following elimination rule, based on Remark 1. Let C be the clique of size $\omega(G_i)$ found in G_i. We first apply a greedy heuristic to extend C to a maximal clique C' of G by adding $k = (|C'| - |C| + 1)$ vertices from $V \setminus V_i$. Then, we search for a maximal k-partite induced subgraph of $G[V \setminus V_i]$. Let us say that L is the set of vertices found in this search, with $|L| = \ell$. We set $V_{i+\ell} = V_i \cup L$ and choose $v_{i+\ell+1}$ as the smallest vertex in $V \setminus V_{i+\ell}$. This corresponds to eliminate the decision subproblems $G_{i+1}, \ldots, G_{i+\ell}$. We tested variations of the coloring heuristics used in MCR and MCS to find k-partite induced subgraphs, namely: the "standard greedy" [25] and the greedy with recoloring [13].

- Each decision subproblem G_{i+1} is itself solved through a recursive enumeration based on the same principles of the RD method. More precisely, the search is performed in larger and larger subdolls of $G[V_i \cap N(i+1)]$ until either a clique of size $\omega(G_i)$ is found or it is proved that no such clique exists. However, a particularity of this enumeration is that it follows its own sequence of subdolls in the sense that the associated sequence of vertices is not (necessarily) a subsequence of $\langle v_1, \ldots, v_i\rangle$. The reason is that the pruning rule described in the previous item is applied as an initial step to determine (and prune) an $(\omega(G_i)-1)$-partite induced subgraph H of $G[V_i \cap N(i+1)]$. The sequence $\langle w_1, \ldots, w_{|V_i \cap N(v_{i+1})|}\rangle$ of subdolls is such that $V(H) = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{|V(H)|}\}$ and, for every $j > |V(H)|$, w_j is the smallest vertex of $(V_i \cap N(i+1)) \setminus \{w_1, \ldots, w_{j-1}\}$. As a consequence, the coloring based pruning rule enhances pruning rules 1 and 2. We give more details of this fact in Section 2.

- A bitmap encoding of G and an optimized implementation of several procedures to benefit from 128-bit parallelism available in the Streaming SIMD Extensions CPU instruction set. This requires the reformulation of the RD method as an appropriate sequence of set operations. When compared with the B&B implementations described in [19, 20, 22], we adopt the same principle of using bitmaps, but we describe the sequence of set operations in order not to need to use arrays of integers. Consequently, our implementation requires less memory

space for these data structures.

Extensive computational experiments have been carried out to compare our algorithm, called RDMC, with effective algorithms from the literature. The algorithms chosen for comparison purposes were MCR, MCS, and recent versions of BBMC because it has been showed in previous works that they clearly outperform the algorithm in [24]. We use in our analyses a specific implementation of MCR, MCS, and BBMC inspired in [22]. In particular, we add a slight improvement that contributes to further reduce the number of explored subproblems. The same basic routines for set operations are used in all our implementations. All the computational experiments were ran in the same computational platform. This aims at avoiding the imprecision resulting from experiments with distinct codes or computational platforms, as pointed out in [14]. Results show that our implementations outperform the best exact combinatorial algorithms in the literature. In addition, our implementation of RDMC is often more efficient than the B&B counterparts for graphs with density above 80%, being more than twice faster in several cases.

The remainder sections are organized as follows. In Section 2, we give an overall description of our RD algorithm, describing its main elements. The details of the algorithm is the subject of Section 4. This section includes the description of the different improvements and specific features listed above. Finally, experimental results and analyses are presented in Section 5. The paper is closed with some concluding remarks in Section 6.

2 Overall Description of the Algorithm

In this section, we give a general overview of our RD algorithm. The main elements of this algorithm, which are outlined in Alg. 1, are the iterative procedure for decision subproblem generation and applications of the pruning rule. In what follows, we describe these main elements. We postpone the details on how these elements are implemented until Section 4.1.

Algorithm 1 RD for the CLIQUE problem

```
1: MAX ← 0, R ← ∅, S ← V
2: while S ≠ ∅ do
3:     Let v be the smallest vertex in S
4:     Cq ← ∅
5:     if DECIDE(G, R ∩ N(v), MAX, Cq) then
6:         k ← EXTENDCLIQUE(G, S, Cq) + 1
7:         MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, k)
8:         MAX ← MAX + k
9:     else
10:        S ← S − v, R ← R + v
```

2.1 Decision Subproblems Enumeration

Recall that the general description of the RD method establishes that, for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, V_i stands for the subset of vertices defining a subgraph G_i and, thus, a decision subproblem. In Alg. 1, variables R and S are used to store the current decision subproblem defining set V_i and its complement $V \setminus V_i$, respectively. Their initial states correspond to an empty decision subproblem. Another set variable, Cq, is used to store the current clique of G, whereas the integer variable MAX

contains the size of the maximum clique found so far. The enumeration is performed iteratively in the **while** loop between lines 2–10. The first step in an iteration is the choice, at line 3, of the vertex v (which is called v_{i+1} in the general description of the method) to be moved from S to R in order to define the new current doll. It is worth remarking that the choice of v determines the enumeration order. It follows that the choice of v as the smallest vertex in R depends not only on the vertex numbering but also on the result of the application of the pruning rule in previous iterations. After executing line 3, we have to decide (with the recursive function DECIDE) whether the decision subproblem $G[R \cap N(v)]$ has a clique of size $MAX = \omega(G[R])$. If this search fails, then $\omega(G[R+v]) = \omega(G[R])$ and we go to the next iteration. Otherwise, there exists a clique of $G[R+v]$ containing v that gives $\omega(G[R+v]) = \omega(G[R]) + 1 = MAX + 1$, which enables the application of the pruning rule. Function DECIDE gets four parameters as input, namely the graph G, a subset R of candidate vertices, an integer ℓ, and an empty clique Cq. It returns TRUE if and only if $G[R]$ contains a clique of size ℓ, in which case Cq contains such a clique. Otherwise, it returns FALSE.

2.2 Enhanced Pruning Rule

A decision subproblem can be pruned from the search when it can be proved in the function call DECIDE(G, R, ℓ, Cq) that it does not contain any clique of the desired size ℓ. The enhanced pruning rule of our RD algorithm is applied at lines 6 and 7. For line 6, it can be noticed that the clique Cq of $G[R \cap N(v)]$ obtained when the call DECIDE(G, $R \cap N(v)$, MAX, Cq) returns TRUE is not necessarily maximal in G. So, we make it maximal with call EXTENDCLIQUE(G, S, Cq), which returns the number k of vertices of S added to Cq. Since we have $MAX + k$ as the new lower bound for the optimum solution, we can prune subproblems corresponding to vertices in S based on a generalization of Remark 1. The basic property used in this pruning is that, in a stable set, at most one vertex can belong to the maximum clique: indeed two vertices that are not linked cannot belong conjointly to a clique. More fundamentally, we use the following property:

Property 1. *Let $R, R' \subseteq V$, $R \subseteq R'$ be such that $G[R' \setminus R]$ admits an k-coloring, $k \geq 1$. Then, $\omega(R') \leq \omega(R) + k$.*

Proof. Since $R' = R \cup (R' \setminus R)$, we have $\omega(G[R']) \leq \omega(G[R]) + \omega(G[R' \setminus R])$. In addition, since at most one vertex of each color can be in a clique, $\omega(G[R' \setminus R]) \leq k$ and the result follows. □

A consequence of Property 1 is that R' is built from R by the addition of vertices from S defining a k-partite subgraph of G. Then, $\omega(G[R'])$ is at most the new lower bound $MAX + k$. For this purpose, we make call MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, k), which moves a maximal k-partite subgraph of $G[S]$ from S to R. Note that the vertices that have been added to Cq by the previous call to function EXTENDCLIQUE do not need to be moved from S to R. Note also that the iterations corresponding to the vertices removed from R are skipped from the enumeration.

A particular application of this pruning rule occurs at the first iteration of Alg. 1. In this case, DECIDE(G, $\emptyset$, 0, $\emptyset$) returns TRUE. So, the algorithm begins by determining a maximal clique of G, of size k, which leads the call MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, k) to provide a maximal k-partite subgraph of G, of cardinality, say, ℓ. The corresponding ℓ iterations are skipped and the RD process starts on $G_{\ell+1}$.

2.3 Sequence of Dolls

The sequence $\langle v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle$ of vertices defining $V_1 = \{v_1\}$ and $V_i = V_{i-1} \cup \{v_i\}$, for $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, and, consequently, the sequence of dolls $\langle G_1 = (V_1, E_1), \ldots, G_n = (V_n, E_n) \rangle$, is determined during the execution of Alg. 1 in the following way. Due to the pruning rule, the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_r$ are of two types with respect to the way they have entered R: there are those moved from S (i) at line 10 and (ii) by a call to function MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH at line 7. Let $it(v)$, $v \in V$, be the iteration in which v is inserted in R (we assume that the first iteration has rank 1). Then, for every $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $i < j$, the following conditions hold:

1. $it(v_i) < it(v_j)$, or
2. $it(v_i) = it(v_j)$ (this means that both v_i and v_j are of type (ii)) and there exists an ordering $\langle C_1, \ldots, C_k \rangle$ of the k stable sets determined in the call to MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH at iteration $it(v_i)$ such that $v_i \in C_{c(v_i)}$ and $v_j \in C_{c(v_j)}$ yields $c(v_i) \leq c(v_j)$.

Besides determining the sequence of dolls, the application of the enhanced pruning rule has the effect that the only information available at any iteration of Alg. 1 about some previous dolls is an upper bound for their optimum, and not their exact value. To make it more precise, let $m_i = 0$, if $i = 0$, and, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let m_i be m_{i-1} if v_i is of type (i), or $c(v_i)$ plus the value of MAX at the begining of iteration $it(v_i)$ if v_i is of type (ii). Clearly, $\langle m_1, \ldots, m_r \rangle$ is a nondecreasing sequence and m_i is equal to $\omega(G_i)$ if v_i is of type (i) or an upper bound for $\omega(G_i)$, if v_i is of type (ii). In addition, the dolls corresponding to vertices of type (i) have the following property.

Property 2. *Let v be the vertex selected at line 3 at the current iteration of Alg. 1. Then, for all $b \in \{1, \ldots, MAX\}$, there exists $v_t \in R \cap N(v)$ such that $m_t = b$.*

Proof. First note that, by definition, vertex $v_j \in R$ having $m_j = b$ with smallest index j is of type (ii), which means that v_j is included in the stabe set $C_{c(v_j)}$ at iteration $it(v_j)$. Since $C_{c(v_j)}$ is maximal with respect to $S \cup C_{c(v_j)}$ and $C_{c(v_j)} \subseteq R$, the set $R \cap N(v)$ contains a neighbor v_t of v with $m_t = b$. □

A final remark with respect to the sequence of dolls established by Alg. 1 is that an adaptation of pruning rule 2 to be used with m_j in the role of $\omega(G_j)$ is useless. Property 2 with $b = \omega(G_i)$ implies that the adapted pruning rule 2 would not eliminate the decision subproblem $R \cap N(v)$.

3 A Comparative Example

The main differences between RD and B&B algorithms, both using partial colorings for pruning purposes, are illustrated in this section by means of an example. Indeed, as one may see with this example, the differences between the two approaches make them complementary to each other. We show the executions of Alg. 1 and an improved version of the algorithm in [22] for the graph of Fig. 1. In both cases, we consider that the same greedy heuristics for clique and partial coloring generation are used. In these heuristics, vertices are examined in an increasing order of vertex identity.

In Fig. 2, the iterations of Alg. 1 are represented by the decision subproblems generated and the states of the two sets R and S attained during its manipulations. In the first iteration, the corresponding decision subproblem is related to the empty subgraph of G and $MAX = 0$. Since it is



Figure 1: Graph

a "yes" instance, an extended clique (starting with clique $\{0\}$) and a partial coloring are construted, generating the states depicted in Fig. 2(a). Extending $\{0\}$ in an increasing order of vertex indices gives the maximal clique $\{0,1\}$. Thus, MAX is incremented by 2, which leads to a partial coloring of the vertices in S with the 2 colors $C_1 = \{0,2,5\}$ and $C_2 = \{1,3,9\}$, pruning the so colored vertices by moving them to R. It is straightforward to check that, as predicted by Property 1, the subgraph induced by the colored vertices does not contain any clique of size larger than 2. In the second iteration (Fig. 2(b)), when selected, the smallest vertex in S (vertex 4) generates a "no" decision subproblem. Note that, according to Property 2, this decision subproblem cannot be eliminated because $m_5 = 2$, for $v_5 = 3$. Finally, in the third iteration of Fig. 2(c), MAX is incremented by 2 again, which prunes all remaining vertices in S. In summary, the execution has the characteristics shown in Table 1.

Decision subprolem solved	New solution found	New solution extended	MAX incremented by
$\emptyset = \emptyset \cap N(0)$	$\{0,1\}$	$\{0,1\}$	2
$\{0,3,5\} = \{0,1,2,3,5,9\} \cap N(4)$	–	–	–
$\{0,2,3,5\} = \{0,1,2,3,4,5,9\} \cap N(6)$	$\{2,3,6\}$	$\{2,3,6,7\}$	2
Colors constructed by calls to maxPartiteSubgraph: $\{0,2,5\}$, $\{1,3,9\}$, $\{6,8\}$, and $\{7\}$ Uncolored vertex: 4			

Table 1: Summary of execution at Fig. 2.

The version of the B&B algorithm in [22] that we use to compare with Alg. 1 is outlined in Alg. 2. In this algorithm, R is the set of colored vertices, S is the set of uncolored candidate vertices, and CUR is the size of the clique defining the current node of the search tree. The point to be highlighted is the call optimize(G, $(R \cup S) \cap N(v)$, $CUR + 1$) at line 6. In comparison with call decide(G, $R \cap N(v)$, MAX, Cq) at line 5 of Alg. 1, we can observe two differences. First, contrary to the RD algorithm, the subgraph involved in the B&B version includes the vertices in $R \cap N(v)$. As a consequence, the second difference is that the subproblem is an optimization problem. In Fig. 3, the execution of the call optimize(G, V, 0) is shown. The main idea behind the recursive function optimize is the same as the BBMC algorithm. With respect to the algorithm described in Subsection 1.2, there is a modification originally proposed in [22]. It consists in the



(a) First iteration. Vertex selected is 0. Two states attained after call DECIDE$(G, \emptyset, 0, \emptyset)$. At the end, $MAX = 2$.



(b) Second iteration. Vertex selected is 4. A state attained after call DECIDE$(G, \{0, 3, 5\}, 2, \emptyset)$.



(c) Third iteration. Vertex selected is 6. Two states attained after call DECIDE$(G, \{2, 3, 5\}, 2, \emptyset)$. At the end, $MAX = 4$.

Figure 2: Execution of Alg. 1 for the graph of Fig. 1, with initial state $S = \{0, \ldots, 9\}$, $R = \emptyset$, and $MAX = 0$. The sequence of dolls corresponds to $\langle 0, 2, 5, 1, 3, 9, 4, 6, 8, 7 \rangle$.

use of a partial coloring of the set of unexplored vertices, as indicated in line 3 of Alg. 2, with the purpose of determining the vertices that can be pruned from the search due to their upper bounds. For the vertices that remain uncolored after line 3, the corresponding optimization subproblems are generated and solved recursively. As an additional improvement, we introduce line 8 to prune additional vertices whenever the current best solution value is incremented during the recursive call.

Algorithm 2 Partial coloring B&B

```
1: function OPTIMIZE(G, S, CUR)
2:     R ← ∅, MAX ← max{MAX, CUR}, k ← MAX − CUR
3:     MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, k)
4:     while S ≠ ∅ do
5:         Let v be the greatest vertex in S
6:         OPTIMIZE(G, (R ∪ S) ∩ N(v), CUR + 1)
7:         S ← S − v
8:         MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, MAX − CUR − k)
9:         k ← MAX − CUR
```

The execution of the partial coloring B&B algorithm results in the generation of three optimization subproblems, corresponding to the three recursive calls represented in figures 3(a), 3(b), and 3(c). The execution is summarized in Table 2.

There are some relevant remarks with respect to the subproblems generated during the execution of Alg. 1 and Alg. 2. First, the optimization subproblems tend to be defined by larger subgraphs

than the decision subproblems as a consequence of the complementary selection strategies (lines 3 of Alg. 1 and line 5 of Alg. 2). Second, the upper bound used to prune nodes tends to be tighter with the selection strategy of Alg. 1. For instance, the upper bound for the subgraph induced by $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ obtained in the second iteration of Alg. 1 (Fig. 2(b)) is 2, whereas the upper bound for the same subgraph is 3 in second optimization subproblem (Fig. 3(b)). On the other hand, the choice of the greatest vertex in line 5 of Alg. 2, complementary to the choice of the smallest one in Alg. 1, tends to generate better lower bounds faster. One example occurs in figures 2(b) and 3(b), in which cases the lower bounds are 2 and 3, respectively.



After MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH$(G, \{0\text{–}8\}, \emptyset, 2)$

(a) First optimization subprobem. Vertex selected is 9. State attained after call OPTIMIZE$(G, \{0, 8\}, 1)$. At the end, $MAX = 2$.



After MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH$(G, \{4, 6, 7\}, \{0\text{–}3, 5\}, 1)$

(b) Second optimization subproblem. Vertex selected is 8. State attained after call OPTIMIZE$(G, \{1, 2, 4, 7\}, 1)$. At the end, $MAX = 3$.



After MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH$(G, \emptyset, \{0\text{–}6\}, 1)$

(c) Third optimization subproblem. Vertex selected is 7. State attained after call OPTIMIZE$(G, \{2, 3, 6\}, 1)$. At the end, $MAX = 4$.

Figure 3: Execution of Alg. 2 corresponding to the call OPTIMIZE$(G, V, 0)$, where G is the graph of Fig. 1.

Decision subprolem solved	New solution found	MAX incremented by
$\{0, 8\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\} \cap N(9)$	$\{0, 9\}$	2
$\{1, 2, 4, 7\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\} \cap N(8)$	$\{1, 2, 8\}$	1
$\{2, 3, 6\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\} \cap N(7)$	$\{2, 3, 6, 7\}$	1
Colors constructed by calls to MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH: $\{0, 2, 5\}$, $\{1, 3\}$, and $\{4, 6\}$ Uncolored vertices: $6, 7, 8$		

Table 2: Summary of execution at Fig. 3.

4 New Features

We give in this section more details on the originalities of Alg. 1 with respect to the original RD algorithm proposed in [24]. As mentioned in the Introduction, some of these new features appear in B&B algorithms in the literature. In subsections 4.1 and 4.2, we give details on how we adapted them to the RD method.

4.1 Bit-Parallelism

Exploiting bit-level parallelism in sets encoded as bitmaps is central in our algorithm due to its ability to speedup some operations that are executed very often during the search. Its effectiveness

has already been proved in B&B algorithms [19, 22]. In this subsection, we describe the bitmap data structure and the notation adopted for its elementary operations. The application of such operations in our algorithm is left to next subsections.

A *bitmap* B_n is a special encoding of a directly addressed set $B \subseteq [n]$ whose elements are represented as bits in an array. In such an encoding, for every $i \in [n]$, bit indexed i in B_n is 1 if and only if i is an element of B. For example, the subset $\{1, 3, 6\}$ of [8] is encoded as 01010010. Naturally, instead of being viewed as an array of bits, a bitmap is stored as an array of *bitmap nodes* (or simply *nodes*), each of the same size (in bits), denoted by w. If we take $w = 4$ in the previous example, the bitmap consists of an array of two nodes: node of index 0 in the array has value 0101, and the one of index 1 is 0010. Typically, the size w of a node corresponds to the number of bits of a CPU register. We assume that w is a power of 2 (which is a reasonable assumption since it equals 32, 64, 128, 256, or 512 in nowadays computers). The size, in nodes, of B_n is $\lceil n/w \rceil$ and accessing an element i of the set stored in B_n implies finding first the correct node and then addressing the exact bit in this node. Formulas of bit displacement allow this: for instance $i \gg log_2 w$ gives the node index corresponding to the i's bit in the bitmap.

Typical applications of bitmaps occur in problems involving the manipulation of sets of vertices or edges of a graph. In our algorithms, bitmaps are used to store the lines of the adjacency matrix of G. For the sake of notation, the bitmap containing the neighborhood of a vertex v (which is composed by $\lceil n/w \rceil$ nodes) is written $\text{NEIG}(G, v)$. In addition, bitmaps are used to store working sets, as detailed in next subsections.

Some of the operations performed on bitmaps involve only one element of the set at hand and cannot benefit from bit-parallelism. Some of them arise in our algorithms, namely:

- $\text{ADD}(B_n, v)$: adds the element $v < n$ to bitmap B_n (determine the node containing v and set in this node the corresponding bit to 1).
- $\text{REM}(B_n, v)$: removes the element $v < n$ from bitmap B_n (determine the node containing v and set in this node the corresponding bit to 0).
- $\text{FSB}(B_n, i, n)$: returns the smallest element in $\{i, \ldots, n-1\} \cap B$ (which corresponds to the index of the least significant bit greater than or equal to i that equals 1 in bitmap B_n). Such an operation is more time consuming with respect to the previous ones since it could incur a search in several nodes of the bitmap. The search in a node e is done by means of the special function $\text{LSB}(e)$ returning the least significant bit of node e (a negative number is returned if the value of e is zero). In many nowadays processors, such a function is provided by the assembler set of instructions. For details on efficient implementations of $\text{LSB}(e)$, we refer the reader to [19] and references therein.

Bit-parallelism is particularly effective in classical set operations that occur often in our algorithm. The notation for these operations is the following:

- $\text{INTER}(B_n, B'_n, n)$: the intersection of the two bitmap encoded sets B and B' is computed (by making a logical & on each pair of corresponding nodes of B_n and B'_n) and returned.
- $\text{DIFF}(B_n, B'_n, n)$: the difference $B \setminus B'$ of two bitmap encoded sets is computed (by making the call $\text{INTER}(B_n, \bar{B}'_n, n)$) and returned.

4.2 Upper Bounds by Vertex Coloring

We have studied two different partial coloring heuristics to implement the generic function MAX-PARTITESUBGRAPH in our algorithm. Their descriptions and bit-parallel implementations are given below. Both are direct adaptations of greedy heuristics used in B&B algorithms like [19, 11, 13].

4.2.1 Greedy Coloring

This first heuristic is the adaptation of the very classical and simple greedy heuristic where the vertices are considered sequentially, each vertex being colored with the smallest possible color. However, two characteristics of our implementation depicted in Alg. 3 have to be mentioned. First, the coloring is done by colors, as in [20], and not by vertices as in classical implementations of this heuristic ([11] for instance). The final coloring is the same but this approach is better suited to bit-parallelism. Second, bit-parallelism is exploited in the set operations at lines 4 (copy of a set) and 7 (set difference). Also, vertices still candidates for the current color d' are enumerated in an increasing order of vertex indices by the use of function FSB (called at lines 5 and 11).

Algorithm 3 Bit-parallel greedy coloring heuristic

```
 1: function GREEDYCOLORING(G, S, R, d)
 2:     d' ← 0
 3:     while d' < d and R ≠ ∅ do
 4:         S ← a copy of R
 5:         v ← FSB(S, 0, n)
 6:         while v ≥ 0 do
 7:             S ← DIFF(S, NEIG(G, v), n)
 8:             REM(S, v)
 9:             REM(R, v)
10:             ADD(C, v)
11:             v ← FSB(S, v + 1, n)
12:         d' ← d' + 1
```

4.2.2 Recoloring

MCSCOLORING is a method to improve a greedy coloring successfully employed in [13]. The idea is to try to assign a lower color to nodes whose initial color is greater than a given value (based on the value of the maximum clique found so far). In our case, this can be done by applying first the function GREEDYCOLORING and then trying to give one of the d first colors to the remaining nodes, belonging to R at the end of Alg. 3. To do so, iteratively for each $v \in S$ we search for a color $i \in [d]$ such that v has only one neighbour – say u – in the corresponding color class (it has at least one neighbour, otherwise v would have been colored with color i). If such a color does not exist, we skip the current vertex v and go to the next one in S. Otherwise, $N(v) \cap R[i] = \{u\}$ and u has at least one neighbor in every color smaller than i. Thus, we search for a color j, $i < j < d$, that could accommodate u. If such a color is found, move u to color j and v to color i and insert v in S. So, the number of vertices colored (in one of the d first colors) has been increased. We do not detail the algorithm but, again, the operations FSB, ADD, REM, and INTER have to be applied allowing to benefit from bit parallelism.

4.3 Recursive Russian Dolls Searches

Another originality of Alg. 1 is that each decision subproblem is solved itself with the same principles of the RD method in function DECIDE specified in Subsection 2.1 and detailed in Alg. 4. In special, at line 4, a partial $(\ell-1)$-coloring of $G[S]$ is performed (moving the colored vertices from S to R). If $G[S]$ admits an $(\ell-1)$-coloring (*i.e.*, $S=\emptyset$ after this call), then it can be concluded that the decision subproblem at hand is a "no" subproblem without any recursive call. Otherwise, if $S\neq\emptyset$ after line 4, then R is the set of vertices pruned by the pruning rule. In this case, the vertices that remain in S are the candidates used to generate the recursive calls. So, at each iteration of the loop starting at line 5, a vertex v is chosen from the set of remaining vertices to be added to R and a recursive call looks for a clique of size $(\ell-1)$ on $G[R\cap N(v)]$. If such a clique is found, then v is added to this clique and the function returns TRUE. If not, the procedure is repeated until there are no vertices left in S.

Algorithm 4 Decision subproblem

```
1:  function DECIDE(G, S, ℓ, Cq)
2:      if S = ∅ then
3:      R ← ∅
4:      MAXPARTITESUBGRAPH(G, S, R, ℓ − 1)
5:      while S ≠ ∅ do
6:          v ← FSB(S, 0, n)
7:          newS ← INTER(R, NEIG(G, v), n)
8:          if DECIDE(G, newS, ℓ − 1, Cq) then
9:              ADD(Cq, v)
10:             return TRUE
11:         ADD(R, v)
12:         REM(S, v)
13:     return TRUE if ℓ = 0, and FALSE otherwise
```

4.4 Fiding Good Solutions Faster

The effectiveness of Alg. 1 depends on the number of executions of line 8 of Alg. 4 or, equivalently, the number of recursive calls to function DECIDE when exploring the generated dolls. In our implementation, we adopt the following strategy to try to reduce this number of recursive calls. Let us consider that a doll, say G_i, is generated at line 5 of Alg. 1. Also, let a recursive call in the search associated with G_i be characterized by a pair $(Cq, newS)$ of a clique Cq of G_i and a set $newS\subseteq V_i$ of candidates. Since $\omega(G_i)\leq MAX+1$, the search in G_i can be interrupted at any point if a better clique of G, *i.e.* a clique of size at least $MAX+1$, exist. For the purpose of possibly interrupting the search in G_i, we perform calls to EXTENDCLIQUE$(G, newS\cup(V\setminus V_i), Cq)$ to some selected pairs $(Cq, newS)$. Such a call occurs just before line 8 of Alg. 4 and determines a clique Cq' which contains Cq and vertices from $newS$ or $V\setminus V_i$. If $|Cq'|>MAX$, then the search in G_i is interrupted and MAX gets $|Cq'|$. Otherwise, the search in G_i continues. In order to avoid the overhead of an excessive number of calls to EXTENDCLIQUE, they are only performed when $|Cq|\geq MAX/2$.

5 Experimental Results

In this section we provide and analyze results of extensive computational experiments. Our main goal is to assess whether the Russian Dolls method is effective at exploiting bit-parallelism and partial colorings to accelerate the search for a maximum clique when compared to Branch and Bound. To this end, the computational experiments were carried out with implementations in the C programming language of Alg. 1 and of Alg. 2. They are called RDMC and PBBMC, respectively. The same routines describer in subsections 4.1 and 4.2, for bit-parallel operations and for partial colorings, respectively, are used in both implementations. This methodology aims at avoiding the influence of programming settings (such as the programming language adopted or strategies for memory management) in the analysis of the algorithms. Moreover, we also compare our results with calibration times of previous experiments in the literature. Even being imprecise in nature, this allows checking if the computation times of our implementations are compatible with previous works.

Four versions of each implementation have been tested to compare the effectiveness of different partial coloring heuristics and vertex orderings. For each implementation, the notation X/Y stands for the combination coloring heuristic (X) and vertex ordering (Y). The partial coloring heuristics tested were greedyColoring ($X = 1$) and MCScoloring ($X = 2$). At the beginning of each implementation, vertices of G are renumbered according to a specific order. This renumbering fixes the order employed in all executions of partial coloring heuristics and determines the selection strategies. The orders tested were the one given by the MCR initial vertex sorting in [11] ($Y = 3$) and the one by nonincreasing degree ($Y = 4$). We do not apply an Iterated Local Search as in [16] since we are interested in studying the behavior of the search procedure, including its ability to find good solutions fast.

The results were obtained with experiments on a computer running a 64-bit Linux operating system and `gcc` as the C compiler (with compiling options `-m64 -O3 -msse4.2`). All bit-parallel operations are implemented with the Streaming SIMD Extensions Instructions for 128 bits. We ran all of our implementations with DIMACS challenge [26] and BHOSHLIB (in particular, subset `frb30-15`) [27] benchmark graphs and with randomly generated graphs. For the sake of comparison, experimental results presented in [13] (algorithms MCR and MCS), and [22] (algorithms DEF and RECOL_N), were adjusted according to the usual DIMACS challenge methodology [26] (adopted, for instance, in [13]). The average values (T_1/T_2 and T_1/T_3) of the user times in [13] (T_2) and [22] (T_3) with our user times (T_1) are shown in Table 3.

Instance	T_1	T_2 [13]	T_1/T_2	T_3 [22]	T_1/T_3
$r100.5$	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
$r200.5$	0.04	0.042	0.95	0.003	13.33
$r300.5$	0.39	0.359	1.09	0.203	1.92
$r400.5$	2.41	2.21	1.09	1.186	2.03
$r500.5$	9.18	8.47	1.08	4.587	2.00

Table 3: User times used to compute the average factors of $T_1/T_2 = 1.09$ and $T_1/T_3 = 1.98$ with the benchmark program `dfmax` and the machine benchmark graphs $r300.5$, $r400.5$ e $r500.5$.

The selection of benchmark graphs is shown in Table 4. This selection was made avoiding instances with running times too small or too large. In Table 5, the selection of random graphs n_p

is shown, where n is the number of vertices and $p/100$ is the probability that each pair of vertices is picked to define an edge. These graphs were generated having between 200 and 15000 vertices, and probabilities from 0.1 up to 0.998. For each configuration, five graphs were generated.

Instance	n	dens.	$\omega(G)$
brock200_1	200	0.750	21
brock400_1	400	0.750	27
brock400_2	400	0.750	29
brock400_3	400	0.750	31
brock400_4	400	0.750	33
brock800_1	800	0.650	23
brock800_2	800	0.650	24
brock800_3	800	0.650	25
brock800_4	800	0.650	26
C250.9	250	0.900	44
DSJC1000.5	1000	0.500	15
DSJC500.5	500	0.500	13
frb30-15-1	450	0.820	30
frb30-15-2	450	0.820	30
frb30-15-3	450	0.820	30
frb30-15-4	450	0.820	30

Instance	n	dens.	$\omega(G)$
frb30-15-5	450	0.820	30
gen200_p0.9_44	200	0.900	44
gen400_p0.9_55	400	0.900	55
gen400_p0.9_65	400	0.900	65
MANN_a27	378	0.990	126
MANN_a45	1035	1.000	345
p_hat1000-1	1000	0.245	10
p_hat1000-2	1000	0.490	46
p_hat1500-1	1500	0.253	12
p_hat300-3	300	0.740	36
p_hat700-2	700	0.500	44
p_hat700-3	700	0.750	62
san400_0.9_1	400	0.900	100
sanr200_0.9	200	0.890	42
sanr400_0.5	400	0.500	13
sanr400_0.7	400	0.700	21

Table 4: Selected benchmark graphs and their numbers of vertices, densities, and clique numbers.

Instance	n	dens.	$\omega(G)$
200_70	200	0.700	18
200_80	200	0.800	25–26
200_90	200	0.900	40
200_95	200	0.950	60–62
300_65	300	0.650	17
300_70	300	0.700	20
300_80	300	0.800	28–29
300_98	300	0.980	116–121
500_50	500	0.500	13
500_60	500	0.600	17
500_65	500	0.650	19–20

Instance	n	dens.	$\omega(G)$
500_70	500	0.700	22–23
500_994	500	0.994	263–270
1000_30	1000	0.300	9
1000_40	1000	0.400	12
1000_50	1000	0.500	15
1000_998	1000	0.998	606–613
5000_10	5000	0.100	7
5000_20	5000	0.200	9
5000_30	5000	0.300	12
10000_10	10000	0.100	7–8
15000_10	15000	0.100	8

Table 5: Selected random graphs n_p and their clique numbers. For every configuration, the smallest and greatest clique numbers among the several instances considered are given.

Tables 7 (for benchmark graphs) and 8 (for random graphs) show two measures related to the total number of function calls performed to determine the initial coloring of decision (line 4 of Alg. 4) or optimization (line 3 of Alg. 2) subproblems. The first one is its total number (referred to as "all") and the second, the number of calls that result in nonempty sets of uncolored vertices (or, equivalently, the number of nonleaf nodes of the corresponding search tree, referred to as "ne"). Also the CPU user times (in seconds) measured in the experiments are shown in these tables. The rows are sorted in a nondecreasing order of graph density. For each graph, the results with the four possible X/Y configurations (lines 1/3, 1/4, 2/3, 2/4) of each implementation (columns PBBMC or RDMC) are given. Computation times available in [13] and [22] are also presented. In particular, computation times extracted from [22] are the ones corresponding to the versions DEF and RECOL_N. The times spent in the renumbering procedure are not included in the reported computation times for our implementations. The symbol in the last column indicates the

Instance	Time
5000_10	3
10000_10	27.39
15000_10	92.60
5000_20	9.80
5000_30	20.39
1000_998	1.20

Table 6: Cases in which the renumbering time for the MCR order is significant with respect to computation time.

relative performance s = (PBBMC computation time/RDMC computation time), as follows: "–" for $s \in (0.95, 1.05)$; "$\star$", "$\star\star$", and "$\star\star\star$" for the cases when s is in the intervals $[1.05, 1.5)$, $[1.5, 2)$, and $[2, \infty)$, respectively; and "$\circ$", "$\circ\circ$", and "$\circ\circ\circ$" for the cases when s belongs to $(0.67, 0.95]$, $(0.5, 0.67]$, and $(0, 0.5]$, respectively.

In the results with our implementations, we observe that the order in which the vertices are considered has a great impact on the computation time in several cases. There are two parameters that influences this fact. First, with respect to the renumbering procedure, it has small influence for graphs with density below 75%. However, the ordering of vertices by noincreasing degree tends to perform better than the MCR one with a few exceptions for graphs of density at least 70%. The more remarkable examples are `frb30-15-3`, `frb30-15-4`, `frb30-15-5`, `300_98`, `500_994`, and `1000_998`. In addition, the time spent in the renumbering procedure is negligible for the noincreasing degree order, but this is not the case for the MCR in the cases shown in Table 6. Second, with respect to the coloring heuristic adopted, the version with recoloring is effective in determining better partial coloring and, thus, in reducing the number of explored nodes. This behavior is expected and has already been observed in [13] and [22]. However, even if the recoloring procedure is applied only for the nodes in the $MAX/4$ highest levels of the search tree (which is the case in our experiments), its computation time is too high if the graph is not sufficiently dense. It is worth remarking that the benefits of the bit-parallelism are severely reduced when the recoloring procedure is used.

A time comparison with leading previous works indicates that our implementation of PBBMC is competitive. In almost all cases, the computation times of our implementation are much smaller than the calibrated times from the literature. Even if this comparison suffers from factors due to the programming environment like programming language, compiler, register length, operating system and so on, there are convincing evidences that our implementation is very efficient.

The comparison between PBBMC and RDMC is the main objective of the experiments. Since both B&B and RD approaches employ a depth-first strategy, there is a number of explored nodes of the corresponding search trees whose upper bound obtainable with the coloring heuristics are smaller than the optimum value $\omega(G)$. This may occur only while the optimum value is not found. For this reason, the smaller is the number of explored nodes until the optimum value is found the better is the relative performance of the algorithm. An evidence of this phenomenon is that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between leading implementations (PBBMC or RDMC) and smaller number of explored subproblems, with the only exception of the version 1/3 for `san400_0.9_1`. We can observe that `C250.9`, `p_hat300-3`, `p_hat700-3`, and `p_hat1000-2` are

instances of DIMACS benchmark graphs whose running times of RDMC are significantly faster, which shows its effectiveness when the density is at least 80%. Moreover, there are the special cases `gen400_0.9_55` and `gen400_0.9_65` for which only RDMC is able to finish execution within the time limit of 18000 seconds. This conclusion is corroborated by the results with random graphs, in which cases the best ratios of improvement are achieved. In spite of this, it should be noticed that `brock800_X` are cases with large running times for which PBBMC is faster than RDMC.

Table 7: Comparison of the number of generated subproblems and running times of our implementations on benchmark graphs. Execution times from [13, 22] are adjusted according to the respective factors listed in Table 3. The computation times for [22] correspond to the version DEF and RECOL_N. A blank entry means "information not available."

Instance	**N. of subps** $\times 10^{-3}$				**Computation Time (sec.)**			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
`p_hat1000-1`	169.0	38.23	164.3	36.59	–	0.141	0.140	–
	142.6	30.01	139.0	28.70	–	0.165	0.164	–
	176.7	37.97	174.1	37.20	0.506	0.146	0.147	–
	151.9	30.31	149.7	29.58	0.584	0.171	0.172	–
`p_hat1500-1`	1056	147.8	1451	229.1	5.55	1.30	1.65	○
	951.1	125.7	1377	220.1	4.25	1.51	1.87	○
	1487	220.6	1128	175.6	5.08	1.70	1.36	⋆
	1398	205.9	1033	154.6	5.44	1.93	1.63	⋆
`p_hat1000-2`	22973	6017	13559	3451	2653	77.43	48.64	⋆⋆
	14598	3305	8690	1899	240.8	80.93	50.65	⋆⋆
	39574	11504	20594	5789	284.1	127.7	71.43	⋆⋆
	24645	6402	12895	3217	245.7	133.3	74.08	⋆⋆
`DSJC1000.5`	76070	16081	74259	15532	441.4	87.69	88.53	–
	70427	15331	68479	14768	319.3	96.28	96.12	–
	79916	16289	82514	16969	295.4	92.39	96.76	–
	74569	15578	76987	16257	333.8	100.9	104.6	–
`DSJC500.5`	1084	275.7	1012	255.9	4.57	0.774	0.764	–
	846.3	193.8	779.7	173.3	3.37	0.951	0.915	–
	1183	287.7	1102	266.0	2.13	0.846	0.838	–
	950.5	211.8	874.3	189.3	2.51	1.03	0.998	–
`p_hat700-2`	231.3	57.09	231.3	57.09	48.39	0.738	0.769	–
	162.5	33.74	162.5	33.74	6.10	0.839	0.856	–
	741.3	207.9	345.5	95.32	5.30	2.10	1.09	⋆⋆
	504.8	123.7	238.6	57.25	5.08	2.39	1.23	⋆⋆
`sanr400_0.5`	250.9	62.11	236.2	57.57	–	0.175	0.174	–
	196.9	39.25	185.3	34.02	–	0.216	0.207	–
	266.0	63.91	204.4	44.12	0.433	0.185	0.159	⋆
	212.7	41.94	164.0	26.29	0.520	0.230	0.190	⋆
`brock800_1`	1924228	451474	3544359	904788	19390	2975	5194	○○
	1327872	277754	2488522	600952	10188	3073	5321	○○
	2149229	487116	3891822	964831	9303	3367	5673	○○
	1546067	316388	2861531	682516	9497	3491	5901	○○

Table 7: (continued)

Instance	N. of subps $\times 10^{-3}$				Computation Time (sec.)			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
brock800_2	1654952	387936	4459555	1155932	17492	2599	6448	○○○
	1172568	251211	3189649	806701	9121	2679	6636	○○○
	2063020	474353	4460120	1118033	8533	3200	6388	○○
	1522715	326797	3325413	816754	8378	3338	6700	○○○
brock800_3	1065164	240368	1912833	464107	11829	1719	2968	○○
	757036	159313	1299528	280306	6272	1774	3013	○○
	1228395	269984	1951966	454995	5574	1973	3051	○○
	909264	187194	1395656	295756	5396	2068	3135	○○
brock800_4	679270	145266	2833636	734803	8217	1171	4082	○○○
	480282	96096	1996967	497131	4356	1200	4261	○○○
	2242760	536283	2641180	649939	3987	3315	3886	○
	1695941	403075	1935412	458605	3913	3475	4096	○
sanr400_0.7	55258	16573	55275	16581	413.1	55.48	57.18	–
	35267	9666	35240	9656	197.2	64.46	64.91	–
	64523	18819	67641	19935	129.9	64.34	68.74	○
	43415	11697	45552	12459	139.1	75.22	79.03	–
p_hat300-3	407.5	127.4	154.2	44.19	11.77	0.607	0.260	⋆⋆⋆
	243.8	69.22	93.78	22.74	2.72	0.758	0.317	⋆⋆⋆
	762.1	258.4	242.7	75.07	1.79	1.07	0.402	⋆⋆⋆
	458.6	142.7	149.9	40.95	1.94	1.36	0.489	⋆⋆⋆
brock200_1	307.2	101.7	460.0	160.5	1.87	0.214	0.312	○
	181.7	54.92	271.5	86.64	0.937	0.286	0.424	○
	391.0	129.2	482.5	164.6	0.495	0.269	0.328	○
	254.1	77.52	306.3	95.91	0.546	0.365	0.456	○
brock400_1	178635	53031	218166	66623	1930	216.6	265.8	○
	104981	29024	123173	34472	755.3	237.4	284.9	○
	203454	58646	182531	52453	495	245.5	232.4	⋆
	127091	34221	109789	28684	501.5	276.4	251.2	⋆
brock400_2	70985	20478	163578	51435	791.3	92.61	197.2	○○○
	45361	12912	92685	27352	323.7	99.46	208.9	○○○
	122378	35356	157131	45587	210.4	151.8	198.4	○
	82234	23157	95762	25701	210.8	166.8	214.9	○
brock400_3	127946	39572	119906	37436	1308	146.8	143.9	–
	75133	21945	66964	19342	510.1	162.5	153.8	⋆
	168342	50294	113363	34720	332.0	193.2	133.6	⋆
	105186	29763	69544	20137	342.9	216.9	146.7	⋆
brock400_4	60763	17870	65939	20557	696.5	74.73	81.08	○
	35907	9813	36382	10389	270.3	81.78	85.50	–
	68010	19515	51187	15660	206.5	83.50	61.72	⋆
	43000	11533	31194	8985	213.2	93.54	67.48	⋆
p_hat700-3	166590	42760	96961	24375	74323	649.4	403.3	⋆⋆
	92589	21232	54109	12126	2607	670.1	408.4	⋆⋆
	306990	84282	151510	40865	2578	1173	622.0	⋆⋆
	174538	43336	86027	20922	2296	1231	644.7	⋆⋆

Table 7: (continued)

Instance	N. of subps $\times 10^{-3}$				Computation Time (sec.)			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
frb30-15-1	561752	195532	403867	141579	–	970.4	727.8	⋆
	297794	106338	227680	81421	–	809.7	639.4	⋆
	501918	173172	583655	205002	2361	899.3	1057	○
	304227	106217	358024	128089	3057	824.4	961.4	○
frb30-15-2	564777	196671	587228	205260	–	967.5	1039	○
	323762	115112	337370	120645	–	865.0	899.1	–
	512867	183336	672671	240659	2725	897.5	1193	○
	323978	120593	436865	162446	2102	810.9	1052	○
frb30-15-3	448754	156829	741805	268482	–	779.7	1282	○○
	243166	87841	415467	156231	–	652.5	1028	○○
	163409	59582	319548	121538	1551	294.2	557.2	○○
	111497	41752	216080	84317	991.3	276.3	482.2	○○
frb30-15-4	1781554	627424	843752	287111	–	2961	1540	⋆⋆
	998141	364563	440556	153258	–	2548	1259	⋆⋆⋆
	1125727	399811	483553	163851	4694	1905	901.6	⋆⋆⋆
	753613	277360	297691	103577	3263	1746	789.2	⋆⋆⋆
frb30-15-5	664074	235213	995328	360589	–	1170	1754	○○
	334927	123988	522826	198063	–	897.5	1329	○
	342092	126432	623818	236143	3412	601.5	1075	○○
	239928	91485	457648	177749	2166	546.5	963.2	○○
sanr200_0.9	11607	4539	10304	3998	315.0	14.69	13.18	⋆
	3465	1439	2993	1233	44.69	13.67	12.28	⋆
	14729	5710	14528	5683	27.16	18.22	18.34	–
	6079	2367	5874	2325	21.60	20.76	20.66	–
C250.9	991805	388397	781787	302033	48193	1240	1183	–
	316861	131958	245797	100860	3550	1271	1032	⋆
	1137737	445366	972115	378289	2361	1474	1303	⋆
	459609	182377	390771	154130	1964	1666	1553	⋆
gen200_p0.9_44	197.1	82.04	687.2	286.7	5.87	0.259	0.976	○○○
	66.56	30.46	205.6	93.02	0.512	0.218	0.891	○○○
	329.5	146.1	966.1	427.7	0.766	0.432	1.39	○○○
	142.2	66.60	361.4	167.3	0.493	0.437	1.22	○○○
gen400_p0.9_55	–	–	2364038	910227	6373176	> 18000	6289	⋆⋆⋆
	–	–	666569	261728	63689	> 18000	3691	⋆⋆⋆
	–	–	–	–	–	> 18000	> 18000	–
	–	–	–	–	–	> 18000	> 18000	–
gen400_p0.9_65	–	–	536110	193972	–	> 18000	1527	⋆⋆⋆
	–	–	116621	44894	165240	> 18000	749.1	⋆⋆⋆
	–	–	–	–	–	> 18000	> 18000	–
	–	–	–	–	–	> 18000	> 18000	–
san400_0.9_1	377.0	159.1	302.0	83.82	3.70	0.745	1.00	○
	52.64	26.83	28.50	9.85	0.109	0.340	0.312	⋆
	5275	2194	30308	11794	60.44	13.36	71.00	○○○
	1957	909.4	5088	2170	15.54	8.58	32.82	○○○

Table 7: (continued)

Instance	N. of subps $\times 10^{-3}$				Computation Time (sec.)			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
MANN_a27	37.90	18.30	40.40	19.39	2.72	0.194	0.213	○
	8.92	4.67	9.94	5.32	0.872	0.123	0.139	○
	37.90	18.30	40.40	19.39	0.453	0.178	0.198	○
	8.92	4.67	9.94	5.32	0.310	0.142	0.163	○
MANN_a45	2952	1081	3827	1485	3368	71.05	94.25	○
	242.9	118.7	452.9	225.6	306.2	18.40	31.73	○○
	2952	1081	3827	1485	220.7	63.46	84.82	○
	242.9	118.7	452.9	225.6	53.16	18.10	39.18	○○○

Table 8: Comparison of the number of generated subproblems and running times of our implementations on benchmark graphs. Execution times from [13, 22] are adjusted according to the respective factors listed in Table 3. The computation times for [22] correspond to the version DEF and RECOL_N. A blank entry means "information not available."

Instance	N. of subps $\times 10^{-3}$				Computation Time (sec.)			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
5000_10	522.8	9.95	542.7	8.77	5.77	1.22	1.23	–
	521.9	9.86	542.0	8.73	3.59	1.24	1.25	–
	532.4	10.91	555.9	10.72	2.89	1.25	1.26	–
	531.4	10.80	555.3	10.66	3.28	1.27	1.29	–
10000_10	4707	673.4	5159	832.3	109	21.84	21.92	–
	4645	629.4	5128	812.7	65.40	21.98	22.04	–
	4833	688.9	5056	769.4	49.85	22.34	22.00	–
	4778	650.5	5014	740.1	51.59	22.50	22.15	–
15000_10	20829	2648	20553	3106	556.9	121.0	116.2	–
	18372	1825	18072	2369	356.4	120.3	116.5	–
	21468	2631	22900	3290	284.3	124.0	123.3	–
	19115	1857	20783	2711	290.2	123.6	123.7	–
5000_20	29361	1657	30267	1705	214.7	66.75	67.16	–
	28493	1526	29571	1582	150.4	69.22	70.12	–
	29663	1605	31406	1708	167.7	68.39	70.07	–
	28825	1481	30539	1584	186.8	70.74	72.86	–
1000_30	328.9	51.80	387.7	61.98	–	0.273	0.313	○
	289.5	42.00	343.6	52.08	–	0.316	0.358	○
	345.5	50.80	396.4	59.59	0.986	0.286	0.320	○
	308.5	42.14	355.4	50.57	1.12	0.328	0.364	○
5000_30	1229261	142458	1355238	159621	9448	3335	3538	○
	1104626	114531	1262710	141777	6341	3409	3622	○
	1268906	140585	1354901	152294	–	3479	3607	–
	1151697	115171	1258607	133535	–	3552	3696	–

Table 8: (continued)

Instance	**N. of subps** $\times 10^{-3}$				**Computation Time (sec.)**			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
1000_40	3727	768.7	3699	776.0	17.54	3.74	3.78	–
	3110	494.0	3059	497.8	14.38	4.21	4.14	–
	3908	777.7	3906	794.6	12.33	3.91	3.98	–
	3304	520.4	3289	538.8	13.93	4.40	4.36	–
500_50	949.9	238.7	849.5	211.9	3.92	0.686	0.644	⋆
	738.9	162.3	653.1	136.2	3.05	0.838	0.771	⋆
	968.8	232.3	973.1	236.5	1.75	0.711	0.731	–
	769.7	162.6	768.0	163.1	2.05	0.868	0.874	–
1000_50	75966	16108	74069	15553	430.5	87.07	87.25	–
	70375	15366	68292	14806	316.1	95.01	95.10	–
	79196	16216	76319	15397	294.8	91.14	90.52	–
	73931	15515	70916	14683	326.3	99.12	98.36	–
500_60	11912	3134	11318	2965	68.67	10.42	10.32	–
	8649	1973	8140	1803	43.60	12.55	12.06	–
	13189	3363	12640	3216	28.96	11.57	11.51	–
	9861	2216	9378	2063	32.74	13.90	13.47	–
300_65	1205	360.6	1104	325.9	–	0.931	0.935	–
	836.8	224.5	757.9	197.8	–	1.15	1.09	⋆
	1397	405.3	1318	379.4	–	1.07	1.05	–
	1008	264.4	942.9	242.4	–	1.33	1.29	–
500_65	65250	17831	62803	17193	–	62.30	62.16	–
	50299	14163	47488	13239	–	73.04	71.74	–
	72288	19074	72730	19320	–	69.25	71.68	–
	57809	15643	57619	15642	–	80.83	82.29	–
300_70	3726	1152	3067	932.2	25.07	3.04	2.67	⋆
	2466	720.3	1925	519.3	13.08	3.79	3.25	⋆
	3881	1156	4234	1284	7.04	3.21	3.58	○
	2660	732.4	2917	831.1	7.88	4.00	4.39	○
500_70	492014	143505	465416	135411	3562	521.4	512.1	–
	334038	97140	312075	89662	1677	597.0	582.6	–
	574019	162193	536902	151032	1427	610.6	594.2	–
	412843	117343	381648	107110	1417	699.2	671.1	–
200_80	1187	422.3	1172	424.5	13.40	0.971	0.976	–
	619.0	208.6	602.5	207.3	4.90	1.23	1.22	–
	1469	511.8	1458	516.2	2.59	1.18	1.20	–
	833.0	274.4	820.7	275.8	2.75	1.54	1.55	–
300_80	135194	46638	107192	36505	1377	143.5	120.7	⋆
	69045	23123	52842	17118	429.4	161.3	132.8	⋆
	169699	57512	152912	51628	296.6	180.1	170.4	⋆
	95146	31331	83660	27077	290.8	206.7	192.6	⋆
200_90	17527	6956	13913	5501	705.2	21.03	17.59	⋆
	5738	2407	4493	1879	80.66	21.89	17.88	⋆
	22919	9091	20974	8393	51.89	27.85	26.33	⋆
	9620	3885	8772	3573	41.38	32.52	30.39	⋆

Table 8: (continued)

Instance	N. of subps $\times 10^{-3}$				Computation Time (sec.)			
	PBBMC		RDMC			PBBMC	RDMC	
Graph	1/3-all	1/3-ne	1/3-all	1/3-ne	[13]	1/3	1/3	
	1/4-all	1/4-ne	1/4-all	1/4-ne		1/4	1/4	
	2/3-all	2/3-ne	2/3-all	2/3-ne	[22]	2/3	2/3	
	2/4-all	2/4-ne	2/4-all	2/4-ne		2/4	2/4	
200_95	13572	6072	8592	3778	1386	23.40	15.69	⋆
	2811	1429	1666	836.1	64.31	18.99	12.06	⋆⋆
	13901	6515	9125	4211	126.6	25.00	17.25	⋆
	4563	2249	3016	1468	70.74	27.38	19.14	⋆
300_98	207249	101342	115876	55630	308379	868.2	513.8	⋆⋆
	16007	9236	9045	5174	2859	358.0	207.6	⋆⋆
	181164	97100	72846	38568	–	752.8	329.9	⋆⋆⋆
	36249	21256	15543	9107	–	926.6	401.8	⋆⋆⋆
500_994	9999	5460	5475	2867	–	95.88	56.35	⋆⋆
	140.9	88.76	53.91	33.06	42.51	22.51	7.56	⋆⋆⋆
	21386	15619	1055	723.0	–	191.0	10.73	⋆⋆⋆
	710.0	512.7	113.7	81.42	–	226.7	32.02	⋆⋆⋆
1000_998	5002	3186	2491	1589	–	153.8	78.99	⋆⋆
	9.61	7.40	6.04	4.49	50.14	12.82	9.46	⋆
	13315	10803	5816	4841	–	394.5	177.7	⋆⋆⋆
	185.8	151.2	92.64	75.04	–	803.3	337.2	⋆⋆⋆

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we propose a new Russian Dolls Search algorithm, improving another implementation by Östergård [24] in several directions like the use of approximate colorings for subproblems pruning, an effective use of bit-level parallelism, and the application of an enhanced elimination rule. These improvements allow the algorithm to further reduce the running times of the faster previously published combinatorial algorithms in several instances. The computational experiments aiming at checking whether the proposed algorithm is competitive with respect to the more efficient ones in the literature were accomplished. Results show the effectiveness of the combination of techniques employed in RDMC for hard instances (graphs with a high density). In particular, for graphs of density beyond 0.8, our algorithm is more than twice faster in several graphs tested. These results show that, for some combinatorial optimization problems, the Russian Dolls method can constitute a very interesting alternative to classical Branch and Bound approaches.

References

[1] I. Bomze, M. Budinich, P. Pardalos, and M. Pelillo. *The maximum clique problem*, pages 1–74. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999.

[2] S. Butenko and W.E. Wilhelm. Clique-detection models in computational biochemestry and genomics. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 173(1):1–17, 2006.

[3] E. Tomita, T. Akutsu, and T. Matsunaga. *Biomedical Engineering, Trends in Electronics, Communications and Software*, chapter Efficient Algorithms for Finding Maximum and Maximal Cliques: Effective Tools for Bioinformatics. InTech, 2011.

[4] R. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Plenum, New York, 1972.

[5] S. Arora and S. Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs: a new characterization of NP. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(1):70–122, 1998.

[6] Q. Wu and J.-K. Hao. A review on algorithms for maximum clique problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 242(3):693 – 709, 2015.

[7] E. Balas and C. S. Yu. Finding a maximum clique in an arbitrary graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 15(4):1054–1068, 1986.

[8] R. Carraghan and P.M. Pardalos. An exact algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 9(6):375–382, 1990.

[9] C. Mannino and A. Sassano. An exact algorithm for the maximum stable set problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, 3:243–258, 1994.

[10] T. Fahle. Simple and fast: improving a branch-and-bound algorithm for maximum clique. In 10^{th} *Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA-02)*, pages 485–498. Springer, London, 2002.

[11] E. Tomita and T. Kameda. An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique with computational experiments. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 37:95–111, 2007.

[12] J. Konc and D. Janezic. An improved branch and bound algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Communications in Mathematical and in Computer Chemistry*, 58:569–590, 2007.

[13] E. Tomita, Y. Sutani, T. Higashi, S. Takahashi, and M. Wakatsuki. A simpler and faster branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E96-D:1286–1298, 2013.

[14] P. Prosser. Exact algorithms for maximum clique: A computational study. *Algorithms*, 5(4):545–587, 2012.

[15] P. Segundo, A. Lopez, and M. Batsyn. Initial sorting of vertices in the maximum clique problem reviewed. In Panos M. Pardalos, Mauricio G.C. Resende, Chrysafis Vogiatzis, and Jose L. Walteros, editors, *Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 111–120. Springer International Publishing, 2014.

[16] M. Batsyn, B. Goldengorin, E. Maslov, and P. Pardalos. Improvements to mcs algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 26:1–20, 2013.

[17] E. Maslov, M. Batsyn, and P. Pardalos. Speeding up branch and bound algorithms for solving the maximum clique problem. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 56:1–20, 2013.

[18] D. Andrade, M. Resende, and R. Werneck. Fast local search for the maximum independent set problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 18(4):525–547, 2012.

[19] P. Segundo, D. Rodriguez-Losada, and A. Jimenez. An exact bit-parallel algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 38:571–581, 2011.

[20] P. S. Segundo, F. Matia, D. Rodriguez-Losada, and M. Hernando. An improved bit parallel exact maximum clique algorithm. *Optimization Letters*, 7(3):467–479, 2013.

[21] P. Segundo, D. Rodriguez-Losada, and C. Rossi. *Tools in Artificial Intelligence*, chapter Recent Developments in Bit-Parallel Algorithms, pages 348–368. InTech, 2008.

[22] P. Segundo and C. Tapia. Relaxed approximate coloring in exact maximum clique search. *Computers & Operations Research*, 44:185–192, 2014.

[23] G. Verfaillie, M. Lematre, and T. Schiex. Russian doll search for solving constraint optimization problems. In 13^{th} *National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AIII-96)*, pages 181–187. AIII Press, Menlo Park, 1996.

[24] P. Östergård. A fast algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 120:197–207, 2002.

[25] E. Tomita and T. Seki. An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In 4^{th} *international conference on discrete mathematics and theoretical computer science (DMTCS'03)*, pages 278–289. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.

[26] M. Trick. *Second DIMACS Challenge test problems*, pages 653–657. DIMACS Series in Discrete Math. and Th. Comp. Science. AMS, 1996. Also available at `ftp://dimacs.rutgers.edu/pub/challenge/graph/benchmarks/clique`.

[27] K. Xu. *BHOSLIB: Benchmarks with Hidden Optimum Solutions for Graph Problems – Hiding Exact Solutions in Random Graphs.* Available at `http://www.nlsde.buaa.edu.cn/ kexu/benchmarks/graph-benchmarks.htm`.